

From: ["West Lake Landfill / Bridgeton Landfill CAG" <westlakecag@gmail.com>](mailto:westlakecag@gmail.com)
To: [Washburn](#)
[Ben;Whitley](#)
[Christopher;Gravatt](#)
[Dan;Field](#)
[Jeff;Brooks](#)
["Karl;Kirby Webster;Kunim Dawani;Robyn Kiefer;Scott" <Young;Grindstaff>](#)
["Shawn; Terrie" <Boguski>](#)
CC:
Date: 6/9/2014 12:22:01 PM
Subject: Public CAG Questions submitted for EPA Response at June 16,2014 meeting
Attachments: [CAG EPA Questions June 2014.pdf](#)

see attached.

--

Thank you - West Lake Landfill / Bridgeton Landfill Community Advisory Group

www.WestLakeCAG.org

1. What are the background levels for radiation that will be used by EPA for comparison during construction of the isolation barrier at West Lake Landfill?
2. Provide soil sampling results from 2007
3. Since the last testing of the haul routes was done prior to 2005, Why can't EPA do a testing now in 2014 to acquire a current data baseline from which to work from? Why not test all the places that have not been tested since 2005 til present?
4. My understanding is Thor230 becomes more volatile as it decays. Why, then, is it not possible that some of the rad waste may have migrated? Is it not being responsible to have current data from current testing & not base your position on testing done 9+ yrs ago? -Is the EPA afraid that their old data/results will not stand up against current test data?
5. Even medical science advances from implementing new ways of testing and/or continued testing. Why is the EPA above this approach/protocol to gain possible new information or confirmation of existing info?
6. a) What is the actual number of 'background' radiation that was used to calibrate the machine that tested BMAC?

b) What is the actual number of 'background' radiation in a city in Missouri with similar elevation, no ore-bearing mountains close by, and no atomic (FUSRAP, DOE or Superfund) sites within that county or a neighboring county?

c) To what would the EPA attribute any increase in 'background' radiation in the St. Louis/St. Charles area as compared to the non-atomic city?
7. The recent history of the site indicates that many of the engineered 'solutions' have failed (i.e. the leachate spills, non-reporting gas-monitoring wells, the monitors that failed in freezing weather, the graded hill that spilled RIM into adjacent property, the ripped cap, the recent surface fire). As nuclear expert Robert Alvarez indicated that engineered solutions are prone to failure, what is the EPA's contingency plan for if/when the fire break fails?
8. Is the EPA ROD determining what will happen if the SSE comes into contact with the RIM and/or other potential chemical hazards?
9. At the CAG meeting on May 29, 2014, Dan Gravatt stated that the 2012 NRRB review was related to budget allotment issues. Why did the EPA change the "Review", which is sunshine-able via FOIA, to a "Consultation", which is not sunshine-able?
10. At the same meeting, Denise Jordan-Izaguerre from ATSDR indicated that the technology of the machine used by the EPA was in some way more advanced or sophisticated than the one used for the West Lake Moms group. It is our understanding that both the EPA and the Community Group used 2X2 NaI detectors. Can you please describe the technology of the EPA machine used, explain how it differs from the one the Community used, and what the EPA technology would be able to detect that the other one cannot?

11. EPA to find out if they can legally compel PRPs to offer re-location alternatives for nearby residents during Barrier construction due to odor nuisance , otherwise residents are left with asking Missouri AG to sue Republic for relocation assistance which is a time consuming process.
12. EPA to provide file containing presentations and responses given by Ben Washburn and Dan Gravatt at 5/29/2014 meeting.
13. ATSDR to provide file containing response given by Denise Jordan-Izaquierra.